

2005-2006 SES EVALUATION REPORT

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

PROVIDER NAME: Boys & Girls Clubs of Indianapolis

DISTRICTS SERVED: Indianapolis Public Schools

OF STUDENTS ENROLLED: 53 (Reading), 53 (Math), 35 (K+ Literacy), 35 (K+ Language)

OF STUDENTS COMPLETED: 12 (Reading), 12 (Math), 30 (K+ Literacy), 30 (K+ Language)

GRADES: K-12

TYPE OF DELIVERY: Individual tutoring/small group instruction

DESCRIPTION: See <http://mustang.doe.state.in.us/dg/ses/detail-vendor2.cfm?recordID=0009>

STUDENT/TEACHER RATIO: 3/1

CUSTOMER SATISFACTION

PARENT REPORT

% of parents reporting: 73.81%

Overall score: 3.46/4.0

DISTRICT REPORT

% of districts served reporting: 100% (1/1)

District recommends continuation?: Y (1/1 district served)

PRINCIPAL REPORT

% of principals reporting: 0.00%

Overall Score: n/a

CUSTOMER SATISFACTION GRADE: **A**

SERVICE DELIVERY

PARENT REPORT

% of parents reporting: 73.81%

Overall score: 3.23/4.0

DISTRICT REPORT:

% of districts reporting:	100% (1/1)
Overall score:	87.50% (14/16 possible points)

PRINCIPAL REPORT:

% of principals reporting:	0.00%
Overall score:	n/a

ONSITE MONITORING/COMPLIANCE:	4.0/4.0
--------------------------------------	---------

SERVICE DELIVERY GRADE:	B+
--------------------------------	-----------

ACADEMIC EFFECTIVENESS

COMPLETION RATE:	47.73%
-------------------------	--------

% OF STUDENTS MEETING GOALS (OF THOSE WHO COMPLETED):	91.67% (Reading & Math); 100% (K+ Literacy & K+ Language)
--	--

TYPE OF ASSESSMENT USED BY PROVIDER:	Woodcock Reading Key Math
---	---------------------------

% OF STUDENTS SHOWING GAINS (BASED ON 100% SAMPLE REPORTED):	91.67% (Reading); 83.33% (Math); 100% (K+ Literacy); 92.31% (K+ Language)
---	--

AVERAGE GAIN:	+2.11 (Reading); +1.41 (Math); +.23 (K+ Literacy); +2.17 (K+ Language)
----------------------	---

% CHANGE IN PRE/POST ASSESSMENT:	40.81% (Reading); 22.44% (Math); 2.39% (K+ Literacy); 30.66% (K+ Language)
---	---

% OF STUDENTS WHO ATTENDED 80% OR MORE SESSIONS:	100%
---	------

ISTEP+ DATA (included in academic effectiveness grade):

For each provider, the ISTEP+ scale scores for each student who participated in SES were analyzed for 2005 and 2006 in English/Language Arts and Math. Only students who completed 80% of their programs and had ISTEP+ scores for both years were included in the analysis.

# OF STUDENTS COMPLETING 80% OR MORE SESSIONS:	50
(only students completing 80% of provider sessions are included in this analysis)	

SES STUDENTS ONLY: ISTEP+ RESULTS

For the students served by Boys & Girls Clubs (Indianapolis) in 2005-2006 who met the criteria described above, ISTEP+ scores declined by an average of 5 points for Mathematics, but grew an average of 23 points for English/Language Arts. 60% of students showed any growth in Mathematics, and 80% showed any growth in English/Language Arts. Slightly over 30% of participating students showed one year's worth of growth on ISTEP+ scale score Math, while 70% showed such growth in English/Language Arts. The percentage of students passing ISTEP+ in Mathematics stayed the same; the percentage passing ISTEP+ in English/Language Arts grew by 10 percentage points.

OF STUDENTS: 10 (Math) 10 (E/LA)
(of students completing 80% of the sessions, only those having ISTEP+ scores for both 2005 and 2006 were included in this analysis)

CHANGE: -5.2 (Math) +22.6 (E/LA)

% SHOWING GROWTH ON ISTEP+ SCALE SCORE: 60% (Math) 80% (E/LA)

% SHOWING 1 YEAR'S GROWTH ON ISTEP+ SCALE SCORE: 30% (Math) 70% (E/LA)

% PASSING ISTEP+ (2005): 60% (Math) 40% (E/LA)

% PASSING ISTEP+ (2006): 60% (Math) 50% (E/LA)

SES AND NON-SES STUDENTS MATCHED: ISTEP+ RESULTS

MATHEMATICS

Where possible, each student who participated in SES was matched with a similar student who did not participate in SES. SES students were matched with other students from their school on a number of characteristics, including grade in school, race, free/reduced lunch eligibility, special education status, limited English proficiency, and 2005 ISTEP+ scale score. The chart below provides the results of the match comparison that demonstrates how the ISTEP+ scores and scale score growth of students who participated in SES compare to similar students who did not participate in SES. For Boys & Girls Clubs (Indianapolis), 9 matches out of 10 eligible students (90%) were found for Mathematics. For the group who participated in SES, 67% showed any growth on ISTEP+, compared to 44% of the non-participating group. 33% of the students who participated in SES showed one year's growth on ISTEP+, compared to 11% of the students who did not participate. The SES group's average ISTEP+ score declined by 5 points, while the non-participating matched group's average ISTEP+ score declined by 7 points.

MATHEMATICS						
	# Matched	% Matched	% showing growth	% showing 1 year's growth	Average growth	% passing (2006)
SES	9	90%	67%	33%	-5	67%
Not SES	9	90%	44%	11%	-7	67%

ENGLISH/LANGUAGE ARTS

Where possible, each student who participated in SES was matched with a similar student who did not participate in SES. SES students were matched with other students from their school on a number of characteristics, including grade in school, race, free/reduced lunch eligibility, special education status, limited English proficiency, and 2005 ISTEP+ scale score. The chart below provides the results of the match comparison that demonstrates how the ISTEP+ scores and scale score growth of students who participated in SES compare to similar students who did not participate in SES. For Boys & Girls Clubs (Indianapolis), 10 matches out of 10 eligible students (100%) were found for English/Language Arts. For the group who participated in SES, 80% showed any growth on ISTEP+; the same percentage of non-SES students showed any growth. 70% of the students who participated in SES showed one year's growth on ISTEP+, compared to 60% of the students who did not participate. The SES group's average ISTEP+ score grew by 23 points, while the non-participating matched group's average ISTEP+ score grew by 24 points.

ENGLISH/LANGUAGE ARTS						
	# Matched	% Matched	% showing growth	% showing 1 year's growth	Average growth	% passing (2006)
SES	10	100%	80%	70%	23	50%
Not SES	10	100%	80%	60%	24	60%

ACADEMIC EFFECTIVENESS GRADE: **B+**

OVERALL GRADE: B+